DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 213 315 HE 014 765

AUTHOR	Knapp, Samuel J.; Edmiston, Andrew J.
TITLE	A Study of Student Misconduct at Lehigh University, 1978-1981.
INSTITUTION	Lehigh Univ., Bethlehem, Pa.
PUB DATE	Sep 81
NOTE	53p.
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Academic Aptitude; *Aggression; Athletes; *Behavior Problems; *Cheating; *College Students; Crime; Delinquent Behavior; Discipline Problems; Grade Point Average; Higher Education; Institutional Research; Sex Differences; Student Behavior; *Vandalism
IDENTIFIERS	*Lehigh University PA

ABSTRACT

The frequency of student misconduct and the characteristics of offenders were studied at Lehigh University, Pennsylvania, from June 1, 1978 to June 1, 1981. Three types of misconduct were examined: harm to others, destruction of property, and academic violations. Misconduct was operationally defined and subcategories were developed where greater precision in classification was needed. The frequency of property destruction and academic violations was relatively constant over the three-year period, but harm to others increased sharply in the 1980-81 school year. A significant proportion of that increase could be attributed to assaults that occurred in or near fraternity houses during the spring 1981 semester. In all categories of offenders, the ratio of men to women clearly exceeded their respective proportions in the university population. Also, students who reported participation in major sports were frequently represented among offenders, especially when assaults or academic violations were involved. As a whole, student offenders tended to have lower entering Scholastic Aptitude (SAT) scores and lower grade point averages (GPAs) than Lehigh males in general. However, when student athletes were excluded from the analysis, the SAT scores and GPAs of student offenders did not differ from the Lehigh University average. Appended material includes (1) classification of categories of misconduct, (2) classification of data on student offenders, (3) supplemental information on the method of data collection, and (4) adjudication patterns in the Student Disciplinary Committee. (Author/SW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED213315

A STUDY OF STUDENT MISCONDUCT AT LEHIGH UNIVERSITY 1978 - 1981

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Samuel J. Knapp
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

by

Samuel J. Knapp

and

Andrew J. Edmiston

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

University Counseling Service
Johnson Hall #36
Lehigh University

September, 1981

HE014 765

Table of Contents

	Page
List of Tables	iii
Acknowledgments	iv
Summary	v
Introduction	1
Nature of the Data	3
Frequency of Student Misconduct	5
Characteristics of Student Offenders	18
Conclusions	25
References	30
Appendix A: Classification of Categories of Misconduct	31
Appendix B: Classification of Data on Student Offenders	35
Appendix C: Supplemental Information on the Method of Data Collection	37
Appendix D: Adjudication Patterns in the Student Disciplinary Committee	41

List of Tables

	Page
Table 1 - Sources of Data	6
Table 2 - Type of Incident by Year	7
Table 3 - Three-way Classification of Assailant Identity	9
Table 4 - Frequency of Misconduct by Month and by Year	11
Table 5 - Day of the Week for Offenses	12
Table 6 - Type of Misconduct by Time of Day	14
Table 7 - Assaults by Location by Year	15
Table 8 - Assaults by Location by Time	16
Table 9 - Individual or Group Misconduct	17
Table 10 - Demographic Characteristics of Assaultive Students	19
Table 11 - Academic Characteristics of Assaultive Students	20
Table 12 - Demographic Characteristics of Students Before the Student Disciplinary Committee	23
Table 13 - Academic Characteristics of Students Before the Student Disciplinary Committee	24
Table 14 - Numbers of Students and Types of Offenses Brought Before the Student Disciplinary Committee	41
Table 15 - Adjudication by Type of Offense	42
Table 16 - Student Disciplinary Committee Penalties for Students Found Guilty	43

Acknowledgments

Appreciation is expressed to all the persons who contributed to the study. Dean Preston Parr, Dean William Quay, Dean Robert Cohen, Police Chief Eugene Dax, Sergeant Neil Schlottman, Dr. Carl Ruch and Mr. William Stanford assisted in shaping this study and provided information where appropriate. Ms. Jane Koch, Ms. Janet Psarsky and Ms. Elizabeth Jaffe aided in the tedious task of retrieving records. Ms. Pat Finday and Ms. Pat Kozero prepared the final manuscript. Ms. Linda Lowry, Dr. Robert Panos and Mr. William Sibley critiqued an earlier version of the proposal and Mr. Daniel Weldon aided in the reliability checks. Finally, Dr. Roy Herrenkohl provided an invaluable service by critiqueing the final draft of this report.

Summary

This study looked at two aspects of student misconduct: the frequency of student misconduct over the last three years and the characteristics of student offenders. Three types of misconduct were examined: (a) harm to others, (b) destruction of property, and (c) academic violations. Misconduct was operationally defined and subcategories were developed where greater precision in classification was needed. Data on the frequency of student misconduct were gathered from files of the Student Disciplinary Committee and from the Campus Police reports.

The frequency of property destruction and academic violations was relatively constant over the three-year period investigated. But harm to others increased sharply in the 1980-1981 school year. A significant proportion of that increase could be attributed to assaults which occurred in or near fraternity houses during the spring of 1981.

Data was also gathered on the characteristics of student offenders. In all categories of offenders examined, the ratio of men to women clearly exceeded their respective proportions in the University population. Also, students who reported participation in major sports were frequently represented among offenders, especially when assaults or academic violations were involved. As a whole, student offenders tended to have lower entering SAT scores and lower GPA scores than Lehigh males in general. However, when student-athletes were excluded from the analysis, the SAT scores and GPA of student offenders did not differ from the Lehigh University average.

STUDENT MISCONDUCT AT LEHIGH UNIVERSITY

Introduction

Student misconduct has emerged as a paramount issue at Lehigh. During the last year there have been assaults, thefts, embezzlements, bomb scares, near riots and the destruction of property. Also, rape charges against Lehigh students have been in the criminal justice system. These acts have occurred in an atmosphere in which the authority of the University to enforce basic rules has been challenged. University police officers have been verbally abused and physically intimidated. Students and faculty often claim that alumni influence or parental pressure can be used to vitiate the power of the University judicial system. Of primary concern is the welfare of the students and visitors who are victims of these crimes. Furthermore, the publicity created by these events threatens the public image that the University has earned over the years.

These incidents have generated a wide range of reactions within the University community. Some claim that these events are isolated incidents and that "boys will be boys." Others claim that the documented acts of student misconduct represent the "tip of the iceberg" and that Lehigh is fostering a subculture of violence. There is no shortage of opinions on what the causes are, who should be blamed, or what the solutions should be.

A paucity of facts has contributed to the welter of conflicting opinions. It is not known for example, how much violence there is on campus. It is not known if student misconduct has

actually increased or what the characteristics of student offenders are. More hard data could advance productive discussions and aid in developing effective interventions into the problems of student misconduct.

The following report describes student misconduct at Lehigh from June 1, 1978 to June 1, 1981. Information is presented in two general areas: the frequency of student misconduct, and, the characteristics of student offenders. The data on the frequency of student misconduct were gathered from the Student Disciplinary Committee records and the Campus Police reports. Data on the characteristics of student offenders were gathered from student files in the Dean of Students Office or from the Financial Aid Office.

The use of archival records has several advantages. If recorded properly, such records are nonreactive in that they will minimize the subjective bias of the persons using them. Furthermore, archival records can continue to be collected to assess the effectiveness of interventions. However, one limitation of this kind of recorded data is that it will tend to underreport the actual extent of student misconduct because not all incidents of misconduct are reported to University authorities.

Several elements of the report need to be explained. The report is apolitical and factual. It does not seek to "clear" anyone nor to blame anyone for student misconduct. It does not suggest causes nor propose solutions for student misconduct. Of course, it is hoped that the findings will be useful to the University

in planning effective interventions.

In so far as possible, this is an objective report based on quantifiable data. Categories of misconduct were operationally defined and there was a check on the interrater reliability of the categories used. This reliability check increases the confidence which can be placed on the data.

The confidentiality of students was respected in the report. Medical and University Counseling Service records, which are customarily confidential, were not used. No names or identifying information on any student appear in the report. Of course, in the process of creating the report the names of students were gathered from various sources to avoid duplicating the recording of acts of misconduct (for example, one incident of misconduct may be recorded by both the University Police and the Student Disciplinary Committee). Also, student identification was necessary so that the authors could examine data on offender characteristics. However, only the senior author ever saw the names of the student offenders.

Nature of the Data

Data were gathered for a three-year period (from June 1, 1978 to June 1, 1981). This provided two years of data in which student misconduct was not a salient issue (78-79; 79-80) and one year in which it was (80-81). The report had two general goals: to examine the nature and extent of student misconduct and to describe some characteristics of the student offenders.

Student misconduct was divided into three categories of offenses: (a) harm to others, (b) destruction of property or theft, and (c) academic violations. Further subcategories of these general groupings are found in Appendix A. In addition, hypotheses generated by conventional wisdom suggested additional data to gather. It was hypothesized that several factors might be associated with misconduct such as the use of drugs or alcohol, group pressure, or the party atmosphere of the "Hill." Consequently, information was gathered to address these hypotheses. The presence of drug or alcohol involvement, if the act was committed alone or with others, the location of the incident, and the time in which it occurred (time of day, week day, month, year) were all recorded. Specific categories used in these analyses are found in Appendix A.

Although various sources of data were considered for the information on the frequency of student misconduct, it was decided to focus on two sources of data: records of the Student Disciplinary Committee and reports of the Campus Police. The Campus Police reports included several sets of files including assault, harassment, burglary, larceny, robbery and general reports. The frequency of incidents reported from each set of datum is shown in Table 1.

Decisions had to be made as to which incidents to record and how to classify them. As determined in a meeting of the Student Affairs Staff on June 30, 1981, minor infractions were not recorded. Rather, emphasis was placed on more serious forms of misconduct, especially those which involved harm to others.

The misconduct of nonstudents (including alumni and faculty)

was excluded from analysis. There was a problem in classifying incidents-- primarily assaults-- when the actors were not known. Although police reports could sometimes specifically identify nonstudents as the perpetrators of misconduct, often the police reports could identify no one as the offender. To account for this, three categories of actor identity were established for assaults: (a) those in which the names of the students were known, (b) those in which the University affiliation of the actor was known (fraternity jackets, facial recognition, etc.) but the names were unknown, and (c) incidents in which neither the Lehigh affiliation nor name was known.

Characteristics of student offenders were gathered from the student files in the Dean of Students Office and the Financial Aid Office. Data on student offenders included sex, class, college, GPA (in the semester of the infraction), entering SAT scores, and the economic status of the parents. The specific categories used in classifying the data are found in Appendix B.

More detail on the records used, the methods of classifying events and the reliability of the classifications are found in Appendix C.

Frequency of Student Misconduct

This section deals with the frequency of student misconduct. Table 2 shows the frequency of misconduct per year categorized into type of misconduct. The data in Table 2 were obtained by combining data from the Student Disciplinary Committee records and from Campus Police reports (and deleting duplicated incidents).

TABLE 1

Sources of Data
1978 - 1981

	Frequency	Percent of Total Report
Student Disciplinary Committee	74	24.5%
Police General Reports	139	46.0%
Police Assault Reports	47	15.6%
Police Harassment Reports	18	6.0%
Police Theft and Larceny Reports	19	6.3%
Police Robbery Reports	5	1.7%
	302	

TABLE 2.

Type of Incident by Year

	78-79	79-80	80-81	Total
I. Physical Harm				
Assault	20	22	39	81
Threats	2	8	8	18
Recklessly Endangering Others [a]	13	12	20	45
Other	3	1	10	14
Total	38	43	77	158
II. Property Damage				
Property Destruction	7	7	5	19
Theft	29	24	31	84
Other	6	5	1	12
Total	42	36	37	115
III. Academic Violations (all)	9	13	7	29
TOTALS	89	92	121	302

[a] This category includes potentially harmful pranks

The data in Table 2 record all incidents from the Student Disciplinary Committee reports, including those in which the actors were adjudicated Not Guilty or in which the charges were dismissed. This was done because an adjudication of Not Guilty does not necessarily mean that the act had not occurred. Instead, it may mean that the particular persons charged did not commit the act, or that they committed the act under extenuating circumstances.

As Table 2 shows, the frequency of property damage or academic violations varied little over the past three years. But, the frequency of assaults for 1980-1981 was double over the 1979-1980 year and the 1978-1979 year as well. Furthermore, the frequency of events called "recklessly endangering others" also increased in the 1980-1981 year.

Two methodological factors should be considered in evaluating the number of assaults. First, as mentioned previously, the identity of the assailants was not always known. In some situations, the assailants were identified only as Lehigh students, either through their clothing or because the victims had recognized the students although they were unknown by name. In other situations, neither the names nor the University status of the assailants was discernible from the police records.

It could be argued that the increase in assaults was caused by nonstudents. To test this argument, the identity of assailants was classified in three ways: (a) Lehigh students (names known), (b) Lehigh students (names unknown), and (c) University affiliation or names unknown. As can be seen in Table 3,

TABLE 3

Three-way Classification of Assailant Identity

	78-79	79-80	80-81	Total
Name Known	5	3	12	20
University Status Known (name unknown)	11	10	16	37
University Status and Name Un-Known	4	9	11	24
Total	20	22	39	81

the number of unknown assailants could not have accounted for the sharp increase in assaults at Lehigh in the last year. In effect, approximately 70% of the assaults occurring on campus are initiated by known student assailants.

A second factor in enumerating the number of assaults is that the 1980-1981 figures do not include those students who are currently facing criminal charges for alleged crimes committed in the 1980-1981 year.[1] If they were added, the number of assaults would increase even more. The subsequent analyses include all other incidents found in the Student Disciplinary Committee reports and Police records, regardless of the adjudication of the Student Disciplinary Committee, or the certainty of the student status of offenders.

Table 4 shows the frequency of misconduct by month and year. As can be seen, misconduct tends to peak in April of each year. Also, the frequency of misconduct followed a different pattern in the 1980-1981 year than it had in the previous years. Although the frequency of misconduct in the fall 1980 is only slightly higher than in previous years, the spring 1981 semester showed a sharp increase in occurrences. In spring 1979 there were 35 cases of misconduct; 41 in spring 1980; and 66 in spring 1981.

The frequency of misconduct also varied by the day of the week and the time of the day. Table 5 shows that over the past three years, the pattern is for offenses to increase on Fridays and

---

[1] Because of pending litigation, these students' records were excluded from examination.

TABLE 4

Frequency of Misconduct by Month and by Year

	78-79	79-80	80-81	Total
June	0	1	1	2
July	0	2	0	2
August	3	2	4	9
September	12	11	12	35
October	10	10	14	34
November	10	6	11	27
December	10	6	6	22
January	6	3	14	23
February	3	3	13	19
March	5	9	10	24
April	16	18	21	55
May	5	8	8	21
	80	79	114	273

Excluded Academic Violations

TABLE 5

Day of the Week for Offenses

1978 - 1981

Sunday	27
Monday	27
Tuesday	30
Wednesday	28
Thursday	32
Friday	51
Saturday	72
	267

This excludes some incidents in which no time could be fixed .

Saturdays. Also, the frequency of misconduct varied by time of day. Table 6 shows that 69% of misconduct (and 78% of assaults) occurred from 9 P.M. to 5 A.M.

A series of analyses was conducted to see if location was a factor related to type of misconduct. Data presented in Table 7 show little association between assaults and location for the 1978-1979 and the 1979-1980 school years. Assaults were as likely to be reported in residence halls as fraternities. But, in 1980-1981 the number of assaults in or near fraternities increased dramatically, whereas the number of assaults in other locations remained approximately the same.

Table 8 shows that over a three-year period, the largest number of assaults (regardless of location) occurred at night (from 9 P.M. to 5 A.M.). It appears that a significant proportion of the increase in student misconduct over the last year can be attributed to assaults which occurred in or near fraternity houses at night.

Attempts were made to assess the frequency in which group (corporate) misconduct occurred as opposed to individual misconduct. As can be seen in Table 9, group participation was associated with a high percentage of student misconduct. It appears that the social and interpersonal context is an important influence associated with misconduct at Lehigh.

The role of drug and alcohol involvement in student misconduct has been a significant campus concern. A review of the misconduct records revealed no consistent means by which drug or alcohol involvement could be reliably determined. Consequently, no incident

TABLE 6

Type of Misconduct by Time of Day

1978 - 1981

	Assaults	Other Physical Harm	Property Damage	Total
9 P.M. to 5 A.M.	62	45	68	175
5 A.M. to 1 P.M.	6	10	9	25
1 P.M. to 9 P.M.	12	22	18	52
	80	77	95	252

This Table excludes academic violations and some incidents in which the time of day could not be fixed.

TABLE 7

Assaults by Location by Year

	78-79	79-80	80-81	Total
Residence Halls	3	7	8	18
Fraternities	12	7	30	49
Other	5	8	0	13
Total	20	22	38	80

Note: One incident did not have a location recorded.

TABLE 8

Assaults by Location by Time
1978 - 1981

	9 PM to 5 AM	5 AM to 1 PM	1 PM to 9 PM	Total
Residence Halls	13	1	4	18
Fraternities	41	3	5	49
Other	8	2	3	13
Total	62	6	12	80

Note: One incident did not have a location recorded.

TABLE 9

Individual or Group Misconduct
1978 - 1981

	Individual	Group	Total
Physical Harm	43	93	136
Property Damage	29	49	78
Academic Violations	19	10	29
Total	91	152	243

was found in which drug usage was recorded, but some data on alcohol usage was discerned.

Of 41 instances in which alcohol usage was noted, 33 cases were in connection with physical harm and of these, 23 were assaults. The pattern of alcohol-related incidents steadily increased over the three-year period examined: 8 occurred in 1978-1979, 12 in 1979-1980, and 21 in 1980-1981.

Characteristics of Student Offenders

Originally, the authors planned to acquire data on all student offenders. However, it soon became evident such a project would exceed the funds allotted for the study. Consequently, it was necessary to reduce the scope of the study. Instead, data were gathered only on two groups of student offenders: those who engaged in assaults, and those who came before the Student Disciplinary Committee. The results are reported below.

Characteristics of Assaultive Students: The population of assaultive students included 14 students identified from the Student Disciplinary Committee files and 24 students identified from the Campus Police reports. Table 10 shows the sex, college and class standing of the assaultive students. All except one of the assailants were male. The percentage of assaultive students enrolled in each college approximated the total male enrollment according to college. A disproportionately high number of assaultive students were sophomores, but it is not known if this is a meaningful trend or a chance finding.

The academic ability and scholastic performance of assaultive students tended to be lower than the average Lehigh male. As shown in Table 11, the assaultive students had lower GPA's and SAT scores

TABLE 10

Demographic Characteristics of Assaultive Students
1978 - 1981

MALE	37
FEMALE	1
FRESHMEN	8
SOPHOMORES	14
JUNIORS	7
SENIORS	9
ARTS AND SCIENCE	8
BUSINESS	8
ENGINEERING	22
GPA	2.39
SAT-Verbal	504
SAT-Math	634
MAJOR ATHLETES	15
MINOR ATHLETES	5
NON-ATHLETES	18

TABLE 11

Academic Characteristics of Assaultive Students

	GPA	SAT-Verbal	SAT-Math
Lehigh Average (Male)	2.61[a]	539[b]	639[b]
Total Assaultive[c]	2.39	504	634
Major Athletics[d]	2.38	480	602
Minor Athletics[e]	2.49	484	668
Non-Athlete[f]	2.37	534	653

[a]Data compiled for undergraduate males for academic year 1978-1979

[b]Data from 1978 CEEB Report on Class of 1982

[c]N = 37 for GPA and N = 36 for SAT scores

[d]N = 15 for GPA and N = 15 for SAT scores

[e]N = 4 for GPA and N = 5 for SAT scores

[f]N = 18 for GPA and N = 16 for SAT scores

Note: Scholastic data was missing on several students.

than the average Lehigh male. But, these differences tended to disappear when student-athletes were deleted from the analysis. For the purposes of this study, student-athletes were defined as those who had participated in major sports (football, wrestling, basketball and baseball) at any time during their career at Lehigh. Minor athletes were those who had participated in minor sports (track, Rifle Club, etc.) and non-athletes participated in no sport or had only participated in intramurals. Athletic involvement was obtained from the extracurricular activity forms completed by each student and filed in the Dean of Students Office.

Among Lehigh students, lower parental income does not appear to be associated with assaultive behavior. Nine of 38 (24%) of the assaultive students had filed for financial aid and reported parental income under $35,000. This is lower than the 35% of all Lehigh students who filed similar statements with the Office of Financial Aid. If anything, the data suggest that students of more limited economic means are underrepresented among assaultive students.

Characteristics of Students Before the Student Disciplinary Committee: Collectively, 108 students were involved in 74 incidents brought before the Student Disciplinary Committee. There were more students than incidents because on some occasions multiple students participated in the same incident. It should be noted too, that the offenses examined here are those confined to the areas under investigation and do not include all cases posted before the Student Disciplinary Committee.

It will be recalled that the three broad categories of students used were: (a) those involved in acts of physical harm,

(b) those involved in acts of property damage, and (c) those involved in academic violations. Here the category Physical Harm includes assaults and other forms of behaviors referred to in Appendix A. There is some overlap in that persons who committed assaults and were also before the Student Disciplinary Committee are recorded both here and in the previous section on assaults.

Table 12 shows the sex, class and college of each group of student offenders. All persons involved in physical harm or property damage were males. Women were only involved in academic violations. There appeared to be no meaningful trend in regard to the class standing of the offenders. Academic violators were more likely to come from the College of Arts and Sciences, although this trend disappears when student-athletes are deleted from the analysis.

As shown in Table 13, students before the Student Disciplinary Committee had academic ability and scholastic performance below that of the average Lehigh male. However, as with assaultive students, these differences tended to disappear when student-athletes were analyzed separately.

As noted earlier in the report, participants in major sports were often involved in student misconduct. More specifically, student-athletes were involved in 14 out of 38 assaults and 28 out of 108 cases before the Student Disciplinary Committee. Seventeen of the 47 students cited for academic misconduct were student-athletes.

Finally, among Lehigh students, lower parental income does not appear to be associated with misconduct in general. Twenty-two of 108 (20%) student offenders had filed for financial aid and

TABLE 12

Demographic Characteristics of Students
Before the Student Disciplinary Committee
1978 - 1981

	Physical Harm	Property Damage	Academic Violations	Total
MALE	21	40	40	101
FEMALE	0	0	7	7
TOTAL	21	40	47	108
FRESHMEN	7	8	15	30
SOPHOMORES	6	8	5	19
JUNIORS	2	12	12	26
SENIORS	6	12	12	30
UNKNOWN OR G.S.	0	0	3	3
TOTAL	21	40	47	108
ARTS/SCIENCE	6	6	21	33
BUSINESS	4	10	7	21
ENGINEERING	11	24	14	49
UNKNOWN OR G.S.	0	0	5	5
TOTAL	21	40	47	108
GPA	2.44	2.35	2.32	2.36
SAT-Verbal	506	536	501	516
SAT-Math	619	657	611	631
MAJOR ATHLETES	9	2	17	28
MINOR ATHLETES	3	5	3	11
NON-ATHLETES	9	33	27	69
TOTAL	21	40	47	108

TABLE 13

Academic Characteristics of Students
Before the Student Disciplinary Committee
1978 - 1981

	GPA	SAT-Verbal	SAT-Math
Lehigh Average (Male)	2.61[a]	539[b]	639[b]
Total SDC[c]	2.35	516	631
Major Athletes[d]	2.26	479	592
Minor Athletes[e]	1.64	535	634
Non-Athletes[f]	2.47	528	647

[a]Data compiled for undergraduate males for academic year 1978-1979

[b]Data from 1978 CEEB Report on Class of 1982

[c]N = 94 for GPA and N = 96 for SAT scores

[d]N = 26

[e]N = 7 for GPA and N = 10 for SAT scores

[f]N = 61 for GPA and N = 60 for SAT scores

Note: Scholastic data was not available on all students.

had reported parental income under $35,000. This is lower than the 35% of all Lehigh students who file similar statements with the Office of Financial Aid. If anything, the data suggest that students of more limited economic means are underrepresented among student offenders.

More detail on the types of cases before the Student Disciplinary Committee and their adjudication and penalties is shown in Appendix D.

Conclusions

The findings of this study indicate that for the three years under investigation the frequency of student misconduct has escalated appreciably during the 1980-1981 academic year.

Consistent with the more informal impressions of many concerned citizens of the campus, student misconduct increased the most in areas that involve aggressive, acting-out behavior. Data show that this behavior is more likely to occur over the weekends, in group (usually fraternity) environs, late at night and in settings where alcohol is or has been imbibed.

To the extent that data are available, it appears that students reporting a history of active University sports participation are more frequently involved in aggressive interpersonal acts than their peers who engage in no sports or confine their participation to recreational athletics. Also, this group of offenders is the least accomplished in academic ability and performance of all offenders examined and likewise represent 36% of the population committing academic violations.

Caution should be exercised in drawing inferences from the data at hand. It is not known for example, whether the athlete-offender represents a disproportionately large segment of varsity athletes. Further inquiry into this issue might give insight into what, if any, remedial action should be taken. Are such students overly pressed to compete academically with their Lehigh peers? Are there social forces at work that compel the athlete to protect or foster an image at considerable risk? Or are there subtle, but salient, personality factors that hold sway under certain circumstances for some athletes? Should some of these or other factors prove relevant, then the University would be in a position to develop programs or resources to provide the student-athlete with the most appropriate coping skills for the effective management of his own behavior.

Finally, it is important to note that the above observations and comments are based on the discernible characteristics of assaultive offenders, particularly the student-athlete who comprised the most distinguishable subgroup based on the data available. No doubt, there may be other significant variables that are yet to be identified that would alter or further refine the possible relevance that can be attached to these findings.

In the realm of misconduct involving property damage, the findings are less dramatic but no less informative. Generally, the incidences of property damage have remained fairly constant over the three years examined. However, two factors stand out with regard

to the offenses. Most incidences (72%) occur after 9 P.M. and approximately two out of every three acts have involved more than one offender. This suggests that many of the same factors that precipitate assaultive behavior may be associated with property destruction as well. Certainly with collective involvement, social-party variables (including alcohol consumption) are probably closely associated with these acts.

It is worthy of note also, that within the broad classification of property destruction, that property loss, i.e., thefts, edged upward by about 10% over the average for the three years. In fact, in 1980-1981 83% of all incidences involving property abuse were those defined as thefts. What that portends for the future awaits further study. At the least it should alert the University community to the need for greater vigilance and increased security.

The third category of student infractions, that of academic violations, held few surprises. If anything, it seems that the obtained frequency of academic violations was low considering the sheer size of the student population and the acknowledged academic rigor of the institution. However, no reliable source of statistics is available for inter-institutional comparisons. Nonetheless, this category of offenses is inherently more difficult to define and thus to adjudicate. Data displayed in Table 15 (Appendix D) would tend to support this observation in that about 45% of all alleged academic violations placed before the Student Disciplinary Committee are adjudicated Not Guilty or dismissed.

Of the academic violations, cheating on tests is the most frequently cited allegation and accounts for 53% of the offenses posted. Illegal homework collaboration and plagiarism account for the balance of infractions. This frequency ranking seems consistent with the ease of offense observation and the nature of evidence needed for substantiation. One subtle observation is likewise worthy of note: academic violations are not exclusively the acts of singular individuals in isolation of others. Clearly one-third of all academic infractions examined involved two or more persons. In the vernacular, "it takes two to tango!"

With the exception of the lower scholastic credentials of the student-athlete offenders discussed elsewhere, the descriptive characteristics of academic violators did not appear to distinguish them from the student body at large. Obviously, academic violations are not singularly motivated by the crises of failure. Whatever the reasons for such risk behavior as cheating, etc., they are probably more complex than can be accounted for by the simplistic notion of limitations in aptitude or self-discipline.

Finally, some observations seem in order concerning the broader issues underlying this study and its findings. The facts described by this study are probably an underestimation of the actual level of student misconduct on the campus. Several factors contribute to this hypothesis. First, the data tabulated here are based on reported cases garnered from two campus resources, albeit appropriate ones, and do not represent all possible sources or ways of

establishing base-line data. Second, many offenses are probably unreported because of timidity, intimidation or misdirected loyalties of those involved or aware. And third, ignorance and misinformation as to rules, standards and resources may preclude some reportable offenses from reaching the attention of appropraite University authorities. If, in fact the above considerations collectively account for only 10% of the totality of culpable offenses with the campus community, the unnoted costs to persons and property would be significant in their own right.

References

Report on College Entrance Examination Board Scores, Class of 1982. Unpublished manuscript, University Counseling Service, 1978.

APPENDIX A

Categories of Student Misconduct

Incident Recording Card

	Column
Code (Incident number)	1-4
Day of the Week	5
Month	6-7
Year	8-9
Time of the Day	10-11
Date	32-33
Location of Incident	12
Drug or Alcohol Related	13
Corporate or Individual	14
Type of Incident	15
Adjudication (guilty; not guilty)	16
Degree of Penalty	17
Breakdown of type of Incident	
Physical assault or threat	18-19
Property damage	20-21
Academic Violation	22-23
Source of Data	24
Sex of Victim (if assaulted)	25
Sex of Assailant (if assault)	26
Relationship of Victim to Assailant	27
Identity (known or unknown)	28

Days of the Week:

Sunday	1	Wednesday	4	Saturday	7
Monday	2	Thursday	5		
Tuesday	3	Friday	6		

Month:

January	1	May	5	September	9
February	2	June	6	October	10
March	3	July	7	November	11
April	4	August	8	December	12

Year:

1978	78	1979	79	1980	80	1981	81

Time of Day:

"military time" (adjusted up 2 hours for computational purposes)

Location of Incident:

Residence hall	1	Other Campus	5
Fraternity house	2	Other location	6
Sorority house	3	Bookstore	7
Off-Campus house	4	Unknown	9

Drug or Alcohol related:

Alcohol mentioned in report	1
Drugs mentioned in report	2
Both mentioned in report	3

Corporate or Individual:

Individual	1	Corporate	2

Type of Incident:

Physical assault or threat	1
Property damage	2
Academic violations	3

Adjudication: (for Student Disciplinary Committee)

Guilty	1
Not Guilty	2
Postponed	3
Dismissed	4

Type of Penalty:

Expulsion from school	1
Suspension from school	2
Course failure (only)	3

Type of Penalty: (continued)

Disciplinary probation	4
Test or assignment failure	5
Formal reprimand	6
Other	9

Source of Data:

Student Disciplinary Committee Reports	1
Police General Reports	2
Police Assault Reports	3
Police Harassment Reports	4
Police Theft and Larceny Reports	5
Police Robbery Reports	6
Residence Hall Adjudicated Reports	7

Sex of Victim:

Male	1
Female	2
?	3

Sex of Assailant:

Male	1
Female	2
?	3

Relationship of Victim to Assailant:

Domestic (or romantic)	1
Roommates or hallmates	2
Other	3

Identity:

Lehigh student known (but name unknown)	1
Lehigh student name known	2
Identity unknown and student status unknown	3

Breakdown of Type of Incident:

I. Physical Assault or Threat

Assault	1
Threat	3
Suicide, suicide attempt or suicide threat	6
Failure to comply with health, saftety or fire standards	7
Recklessly endangering self	8
Potentially harmful pranks or recklessly endangering others	9
Sexual harassment	10

II. Property Damage

Damage to property	1
Unpaid bookstore debts	3
Theft	4
Embezzlement	5
Trespass	6
Shoplifting	7

III. Academic Dishonesty

Misrepresenting credentials or falsifying credentials	1
Cheating on a test	2
Plagiarism	3
Illegally collaborating on homework	4
Other or Miscellaneous	10

APPENDIX B

Categories of Student Characteristics

Student Recording Card

	Column
Student Code	1-3
Sex	4
Type of Incident	5
Type of Physical Harm (If Applicable)	6-7
Type of Property Damage (If Applicable)	8-9
Type of Academic Violation (If Applicable)	10-11
Adjudication	12
Penalty	13
Class (at time of infraction)	14
College (at time of infraction)	15
GPA (at semester of infraction)	18-20
SAT-Verbal	21-23
SAT-Math	24-26
Sports Participation	27
Source of Data	28
Corporate or Individual	29
Income Level	31
Financial Aid	34

Sex:

Male	1
Female	2

Class:

Freshman	1
Sophomore	2
Junior	3
Senior	4

College:

Arts and Science	1
Business	2
Engineering	3

Type of Incident:
Type of Physical Harm:
Property Damage:
Academic Violation:
Adjudication:
Penalty:
Corporate or Individual:

Classifications are the same as in the Categories of Student Misconduct, Appendix A

Sports Participation:

Major Sports (football, wrestling, basketball, baseball)	1
Minor Sports (Rifle Club, Swimming, etc.)	2
No Sports or Intramurals Only	0

Income Level:

$ 1 - 7,499	1
7,500 - 11,999	2
12,000 - 14,999	3
15,000 - 24,999	4
25,000 - 34,999	5
35,000 or above	6

Type of Aid:

Athletic	1
Nonathletic	2
Rejected	3,4,5
Loan Only	7

APPENDIX C

Exclusion and Classification of Data and Reliability Checks

This Appendix will provide more detailed information on the exclusion of data, classification of data, and the reliability checks on data classification.

Two sets of Police files were excluded. The "criminal mischief (cars)" file was excluded because the perpetrators of the crime could seldom be identified. A survey of the first 31 incidents revealed only 4 in which Lehigh students were identified as possible offenders. The other 27 cases could not identify actors. Also, residence halls security files were excluded because the more severe infractions were already recorded in Campus Police files.

It was decided to delete minor offenses from the study. The following are examples of minor offenses which the senior author judged to be noncontroversial as to lack of severity: playing the stereo too loud, throwing a shoe on top of the Dravo roof, studying in an area which was off-limits, bringing a dog into the University Center, staying in a fraternity over semester break, bringing a pet 10 foot Burmese python on campus to show to friends or dribbling a basketball too loudly in the dorm. All such incidents were excluded from the study.

The following examples of behaviors may be more controversial as to their severity: possession of drugs, playing nude hoops or a wet T-shirt contest. Although these incidents may be highly offensive to some persons, they were not recorded because they did not fall into any of the predetermined categories of misconduct.

Some incidents which were potentially harmful to others were recorded under a special subcategory: potentially harmful behavior. This subcategory included activities such as setting off a homemade cannon, throwing snowballs at passing automobiles or setting off fire-crackers.

Inferred intent was a factor in determining harassment. An incident in which a male walks up to a woman student at night, tells her she has nice feet, and asks her to go for a walk was not classified as harassment. Perhaps the male had an honorable intent but was seeking companionship in a gauche or awkward manner. In this case, a conservative interpretation was taken. But, the incident in which a male jumps out of the bushes and places himself in front of a woman was recorded as harassment. This act, and the context in which it occurred, was likely to cause fright to any person and the act of hiding suggests that an honorable or naive motive was not present.

Inferred intent was also a factor in classifying some events dealing with destruction to property. An incident in which a roommate took property as a practical joke and quickly returned it was not recorded. It was not considered trespass when students walked through an open door into a restricted area. However, it was recorded as trespass when students broke the lock of Taylor Gym and secured entry.

When more than one type of incident occurred simultaneously, only the more severe offense was recorded. For example, in the incident where a drunken student jumped out in front of a moving

car and smashed its windshield, two types of misconduct occurred; recklessly endangering self and the destruction of property. Here the incident was recorded as recklessly endangering self because that was considered a more serious offense than the destruction of property.

The sources of data varied considerably in problems of reliability. Some sources, like the police assault files, were highly reliable. Here the reports had already been classified by the police. In fact, when the senior author analyzed the police assault file, he noted 46 out of 47 incidents as assaults. It was felt that an independent reliability check on the assault files would have led to a spuriously high reliability because the author and the organizer of the police file already had a 98% reliability. Similarly, several other police files contained largely homogeneous groupings of incidents. Also, the Student Disciplinary Committee files presented few problems in the classification of incidents because the charges were clearly specified.

The one source of data which presented the most difficulty in classification was the police general (or unclassified) reports. Consequently, part of this group (40 reports starting on September 1, 1979) was arbitrarily selected on which to do the reliability checks. Out of the 40 reports, there was agreement on the classification of 31 (77%) of them.

Some of the disagreement in the classification occurred because the author had excluded some incidents which the reliability

rater had included. For example, the second rater had included items where a student rode on the hood of a car while it was being driven slowly, and another incident where a student was skate-boarding down the streets of campus. The reliability rater had considered these incidents as recklessly endangering self. But, the senior author had previously considered them as minor and had not recorded them.

Clearly, some subjective judgment was involved in the classification of incidents from the police general reports. But, several points should be considered. First, the reliability was done only on the portion of the data in which reliability was most likely to be a problem. Reliability checks done on other sources of data would have been much higher. Second, the reliability problems were unrelated to the years in which offenses occurred. That is, there was no reason to believe that the reliability problems influenced the direction of the reported results. Finally, data on assaults were least likely to be influenced by reliability problems. The assaults were primarily reported from the police assault files or the Student Disciplinary Committee files where codification was less of a problem.

APPENDIX D

Adjudication by the Student Disciplinary Committee

TABLE 14

Numbers of Students and Types of Offenses Brought Before the Student Disciplinary Committee 1978 - 1981

HARM TO OTHERS	
Assaults	14
Recklessly Engangering Others or Safety Violations	4
Other	3
Total	21
PROPERTY THEFT OR DAMAGE	
Property Damage	6
Theft	29
Other	5
Total	40
ACADEMIC VIOLATIONS	
Cheating on a Test	25
Plagiarism	9
Illegal Collaboration on Homework	10
Other	3
Total	47

TABLE 18

Adjudication by Type of Offense
1978 - 1981

	Physical Harm[a]	Property Damage[a]	Academic Violations	Total
Guilty	17	31	26	74
Not Guilty	2	8	16	26
Dismissed	0	0	5	5
Postponed	1	0	0	1
Total	20	39	47	106[b]

[a] Adjudication results could not be found for one student in this category.

[b] Adjusted total = 108

TABLE 16

Student Disciplinary Committee Penalties

for Students Found Guilty

1978 - 1981

	Physical Harm	Property Damage	Academic Violations	Total
Suspension or Expulsion	2	3	5	10
Disciplinary Probation	14	25	17	56
Test or Course Failure	0	0	4	4
Warning	1	3	0	4
Total	17	31	26	74